PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Application Number

O9/972,741

HEUEIVED TECH CENTER 1600/2900

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number		
Filing Date	October 5, 2001	
First Named Inventor	Allen	
Group Art Unit	1636	
Examiner Name	Qian, Celine X.	
Attorney Docket Number	R-723-CIP	

Total Number of	Pages in This Submis	Attorney Docket Number R-723-C11			
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)					
Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached Amendment / Reply After Final Affidavits/dec Extension of Time Re Express Abandonme Information Disclosu Certified Copy of Pri Document(s) Response to Missin	elaration(s) equest ent Request ure Statement ority g Parts/	ENCLOSURES (check all that apply) Assignment Papers (for an Application) Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) After Allowance Communication to Group (Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) Remarks			
Incomplete Application Response to under 37 CFF	Missing Parts R 1.52 or 1.53				
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT					
Firm or Individual name Mariette A. Lapiz Reg. No. 44,202					
Signature // Avitte / Fapy					
Date	ate October 9, 2002				
OFFICATE OF MAILING					

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING					
I hereby certify that this correspondant in an envelope addressed to	ndence is being deposited with the United States: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20	Postal Service v	vith sufficient postage as first class		
Typed or printed name	ed or printed name Donald Mixon				
Signature	Amald me	Date	10/09/02		

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

N THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Keith ALLEN

Group Art Unit: 1636

Serial No.: 09/972,741

Examiner: Qian, Celine X.

Filed: October 5, 2001

Attorney Docket No.: R-723-CIP

For:

TRANSGENIC MICE CONTAINING MAGNESIUM-DEPENDENT PROTEIN

PHOSPHATASE GENE DISRUPTIONS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed September 9, 2002, concerning the Examiner's restriction to the claims, Applicants hereby provisionally elect, with traverse, the claims of Group I (claims 1-10, 17-23 and 45-52), drawn to a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase targeting construct, a method of making said targeting construct, a cell comprising a disruption in a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene, a non-human transgenic animal comprising a disruption in a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene and a method of producing a transgenic mouse comprising a disruption in a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene.

In the restriction, the Examiner asserts that claims 1-72 are drawn to twenty distinct subjects as follows: Group I (claims 1-10, 17-23 and 45-52), drawn to a targeting construct, a method of making the targeting construct, a non-human animal having a disruption in a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene and a method of producing a transgenic mouse comprising a disruption in a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group II (claims 11 and 28-31), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that modulates the expression of a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene by using a non-human transgenic animal having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group III (claims 12, 24-26 and 32-35), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that modulates the function of magnesium-

dependent protein phosphatase by using a non-human transgenic animal having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene and a method of identifying an agent that modulates or ameliorates a lung abnormality by using a transgenic mouse having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group IV (claims 12, 27, 32 and 33), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that modulates the function of magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase by using a non-human transgenic animal having a disruption in the magnesiumdependent protein phosphatase gene and methods to identify agents that modulate white blood cell count by using a transgenic mouse having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group V (claims 12, 31 and 53-55), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that modulates the function of a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene by using a nonhuman transgenic animal having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene and methods of identifying agents that modulate anxiety by using a transgenic mouse having a disruption in a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group VI (claims 12, 32 and 69-71), drawn to a method of identifying an agent that modulates the function of a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene by using a non-human transgenic animal having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene and methods of identifying agents that reduce pain by using a transgenic mouse having a disruption in a magnesiumdependent protein phosphatase gene; Group VII (claims 13, 15 and 36-39), drawn to methods of identifying agents that modulate the expression of a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase by using a cell having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group VIII (claims 14, 15 and 40-43), drawn to methods of identifying agents that modulate the function of a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase by using a cell having a disruption in the magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group IX (claim 16), drawn to an agent that modulates the function of a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene; Group X (claim 16 and 44), drawn to an agent that modulates magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase gene expression; Group XI (claim 44) drawn to an agent that ameliorates a lung abnormality; Group XII (claim 44), drawn to an agent that reduces white blood cell count; Group XIII (claim 56), drawn to an agent that modulates anxiety; Group XIV (claim 57), drawn to a method of treating anxiety by administering a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase expression modulating agent to a subject; Group XV (claims 57 and 58), drawn to a method of treating anxiety by

A)

administering a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase activity modulating agent to a subject; Group XVI (claims 59-65), drawn to a method of treating anxiety by administering a magenisium-dependent protein phosphatase; Group XVII (claims 62 and 66), drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase; Group XVIII (claims 67 and 68), drawn to a method of reducing pain by administering a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase expression modulator to a subject; Group XIX (claims 67 and 68), drawn to a method of reducing pain by administering a magnesium-dependent protein phosphatase activity modulator to a subject; and Group XX (claim 72), drawn to an agent that reduces pain.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that inventions of Groups I, IX-XIII, XVII and XX are patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to materially distinct compositions that have differing modes of operation, function and effects. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion in that the claims of Groups I, IX-XIII, XVII and XX are related and therefore would not require a separate search or examination that would seriously burden the Examiner.

The Examiner further asserts that the inventions of Groups II-VIII, XIV-XVI, XVIII and XIX are patentably distinct from each other because the inventions are drawn to methods that require different starting materials and modes of operation. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner in that the claims of Groups II-VIII, XIV-XVI, XVIII and XIX are related and a search and examination of these claims can be made without serious burden on the Examiner.

The Examiner also asserts that the inventions of Groups I, IX-XIII, XVII and XX are patentably distinct from the inventions of Groups II-VIII, XVI, XVIII and XIX because the inventions are drawn to compositions and methods that are not directly related. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion in that the inventions of Groups I, IX-XIII, XVII and XX are related to the inventions of Groups II-VIII, XVI, XVIII and XIX. Therefore, a separate search and examination of these claims is not necessary and can be made without serious burden on the Examiner.

Although the Applicant has provisionally elected Group I for purposes of advancing prosecution of the present application, Applicant contends, for the foregoing reasons, that the

restriction requirement is improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 9, 2002

Mariette A. Lapiz

Reg. No. 44,202)

DELTAGEN, INC.

740 Bay Road

Redwood City, CA 94063

(650) 569-5100

Enclosures